

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 13, 2005 and references cited therein have been considered by Applicant. Applicant has, by this Amendment, canceled claims 1-30 and added new claims 31-47

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not identifying at least one support pole. The new claims do not include any limitations regarding a support hole. Applicant reserves the right to add such a claim later in the prosecution of this application and to add a figure which illustrates such support pole.

One of the claims was objected to for being misnumbered. Applicant has canceled such claim, thereby addressing this claim objection.

Several claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112(2) for being indefinite or for having insufficient antecedent basis for a limitation. Applicant has canceled these claims thereby making the rejection moot. Applicant submits that the new claims are in proper form pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Fussell. Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fussell in view of Vicino. Claims 1-9, 21, 25, 27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherba in view of Salesky. Claims 10-13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherba in view of Salesky and further in view of Shapoff. Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherba in view of Salesky and further in view of Colson. Claims 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scherba, Salesky, Shapoff and Colson in view of Antinone.

Applicant has canceled claims 1-30 by this Amendment thereby making the rejections to the claims moot. Applicant submits that the newly added claims are patentably distinct from the cited

art of record. For instance, independent claim 31 is directed to an inflatable device that includes a first interior region that 1) at least partially contains the first multimedia device and 2) includes a light blocking material and a first display screen that is visible from an exterior of the portable inflatable structure. Independent claim 31 also requires the light blocking materials to create a darkened environment to inhibit exterior light from entering the first interior region and to also inhibit light from the first multimedia device from being externally displayed on the portable inflatable structure in a region other than the first display screen. Applicant submits that such a device is not disclosed, suggested or taught by any of the cited art of record. For at least these reasons, claim 31 and all the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by or obvious in view of the cited art of record. Applicant also submits that several of the dependent claims include limitations that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record.

Applicant submits that independent claim 31 and all the claims dependent therefrom are allowable over the cited art of record.

Respectfully submitted,  
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE

By: 

BRIAN E. TURUNG  
Reg. No. 35,394  
1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
Telephone: (216) 861-5582  
Facsimile: (216) 241-1666